

The Indian rebellion in Mexico coupled with financial uncertainty has resulted in genuine security concerns on our southern border—and make no mistake that illegal immigration is a security threat.

A key NATO ally in Turkey faces Islamic extremism and a separatist ethnic movement. Violent Islamic fundamentalists threaten the government in Algeria, and have launched an assault on Egypt. How long would the Camp David Treaty be honored if fundamentalists took power in Egypt?

Islamic terrorists seek to destroy the peace process between Israel and the PLO—and may be having some success. With support from Iran and others, Islamic terrorists also demonstrated at the World Trade Center that America is not immune from attack.

And ethnic turmoil in the former Soviet Union cannot be ignored, as warfare has occurred in five former republics. And the Chechens may be just one of many ethnic groups willing to use violence to alter boundaries originally set by Joseph Stalin.

In short, the list of world "hot spots" is far too lengthy for anyone to conclude that America can become complacent.

REALITY NO. 5: RIVALRY WITH RUSSIA

And this leads to the fifth global reality we must face: the fact that geopolitical rivalry with Russia did not end with the demise of Soviet Communism.

On his last trip abroad, President Nixon spoke before the Russian State Duma, and he foreshadowed a change in Russian-American relations, saying: "Russia is a great power, and Russia as a great power must chart its own course in foreign policy . . . When we have differences, we should not assume they will be overcome by a good personal relationship even at the highest level."

And as we have seen time and time again, the foreign policy course that Russia is charting, is one that is often in conflict with American interests.

For example:

Russia stepped in the middle of the North Korea agreement by offering to provide nuclear reactors—which would have the clear effect of killing the U.S. brokered deal.

Russia continues to threaten prospective NATO members over alliance expansion, thereby confirming the need to enlarge NATO sooner rather than later.

In December 1994, Russia vetoed a sanctions resolution on Serbia in the U.N. Security Council, its first substantive veto since the height of the Cold War in 1985.

Russia persists in supplying weapons and nuclear technology to the rogue regime in Iran.

Russia continues to maintain an intelligence facility and support personnel in Cuba, thereby prolonging Castro's oppression.

Russian pressure, subversion and intimidation of the sovereign states in the "Near Abroad" follows a historical pattern set long before the Bolsheviks took power in 1917.

As Dr. Kissinger said last month before the Senate Armed Services Committee, "... what we dealt with in the Cold War was both communism and imperialism, and while communism was defeated, the trend toward imperialism still exists."

Let me be clear in saying that no one has been more supportive of President Yeltsin than I. In June 1991, I went to Andrews Air Force base to meet President Yeltsin virtually alone, since the United States State Department believed Gorbachev was the "only game in town."

But just as it was wrong to place too much focus on Gorbachev in 1991, it is wrong in 1995 to ignore that fact that President Yeltsin has made serious errors, has moved toward authoritarian rule, and has lost the

political support of virtually all reform-minded Russians.

The Clinton Administration's misguided devotion to a "Russian First" policy—which has turned into a "Yeltsin first" policy—resulted in the loss of a tremendous opportunity to state American concerns forcefully before thousands were slaughtered in Chechnya.

NEW REALISM ABOUT RUSSIA

A "new realism" about Russia and its prospects for the future does not mean a return to the Cold War past. It does mean developing a more honest relationship, one that does not paper over important policy differences with an appeal to personal ties.

New realism means emphasizing the significance of Russia's 1996 elections, and of the pivotal importance of a peaceful, democratic transition of power.

And new realism means that developments like arms sales to Iran, violence in Chechnya, and U.N. vetoes on behalf of aggressors should not be excused, ignored and minimized. Our differences with Russia should be identified—they should be negotiated when possible and condemned when necessary. Such an approach would ultimately serve both the Russian and the American people better than defending, denying and rationalizing Russian misdeeds.

TESTS FOR AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Let me conclude by sharing with you words that Richard Nixon spoke at the announcement of the creation of the Center for Peace and Freedom in January 1994.

"Some are tired of leadership. They say (American) carried that burden long enough. But if we do not provide leadership, who will? The Germans? The Japanese? The Russians? The Chinese? Only the United States has the potential. . . to lead in the era beyond peace. It is a great challenge for a great people."

Ladies and gentlemen, President Nixon was right. Leadership does come with a price tag. But it is a price worth paying.

Dealing with the five realities I have outlined will test. American's resolve and her leadership. If we fail those tests—if we refuse the mantle of leadership—any declaration of victory will be a long time coming.

But I am an optimist. Like Richard Nixon, I believe in America and in American leadership. I believe we will pass our tests, and in doing so, we can claim the biggest victory of all—we will have secured the future of our great republic, and of peace and freedom, for generations to come.

D.C. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a sponsor of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 which is being introduced today by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. Speaker, the crafting of this bill has taken many hours and has involved a wide array of individuals. Our colleague, TOM DAVIS, has done yeoman's work and is to be commended for his skill in forging a strong bill that has bipartisan support in this House. That is no easy feat.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will establish a financial responsibility and management authority

consisting of five members to be appointed by the President, in consultation with the Congress, within 25 days after it is enacted. The key to the success of our efforts in restoring the financial health of our Nation's Capital is the selection of individuals who are competent, capable and have a good heart with regard to the city. The bill requires that these individuals have expertise in finance and management, have no connection with the District government that could cause a conflict of interest, and during the most recent year have paid personal income or business taxes to the District.

There are a few comments I would like to make regarding the powers of the authority. First, all contracts, leases and agreements entered into by the District government will be subject to approval by the authority to ensure they are in compliance with the financial plan. If they are not in compliance, they will be sent back until they are. This is important if the District is going to get to a balanced budget anytime soon.

Second, there is no question that the District's financial management and information systems are inadequate. To deal with this problem the bill establishes a chief financial officer of the District of Columbia who will be appointed by the Mayor and, during the control period, subject to approval by a majority vote of the authority. The chief financial officer can be removed only with the approval of the authority and will be responsible for all financial activities of the District government from revenue estimates and cash receipts to expenditures and cash disbursements.

This is the most important position in the District government from the standpoint of the District finances. And the person in this position must have as much independence as possible if the District government is to get back on track financially.

Third, it has become glaringly apparent that the District needs a truly independent inspector general. During the control period the inspector general will be appointed by the mayor subject to approval by a majority vote of the authority, and like the chief financial officer, can be removed only with the approval of the authority. The inspector general will have subpoena powers and a budget that will be subject to change by the mayor or council.

This has been a problem in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the next point I want to discuss is crucial to the effectiveness of the authority. In the event there is a stalemate between what the authority recommends and what the District recommends, the bill allows the authority to implement its own recommendations whether they are executive or legislative in nature. This power is essential if the authority is to be effective and have any impact on the efficient operation of the District government.

The authority created by this legislation, Mr. Speaker, needs to have control; and it is our intention that it have control; and this bill is drafted so that it will have control over the operations of the District government.

My final comment relates to the concern that has been expressed by several members about the mayor's access to the Federal Treasury. The mayor is authorized by a statute approved in 1937 to requisition funds from the Federal Treasury. This borrowing authority was used primarily for cash flow purposes

prior to the District gaining access to the municipal bond market in the early 1980's. It has not been used since; however, the bond market has looked to this Treasury window as the ultimate guarantor of securities issued by the District. Therefore, it is necessary to continue this access to the Treasury to maintain the marketability of the District's \$3.3 billion in outstanding long-term securities. The Federal Government in essence serves as the District's "State government" and therefore provides the necessary assurance required by the investment community.

Any funds borrowed from the Federal Treasury under this bill will be deposited into an account controlled by the authority and repaid by the District government at the going interest rate plus one-eighth of 1 percent. In addition, the authority will remain in existence until all of the amounts borrowed under the auspices of the authority, whether from the Federal Treasury or from the bond market, are repaid in full.

After the control period ends, The District will continue to have access to the Treasury window. However, under section 209 of the bill, the authority will be reactivated immediately if certain events occur, and one of the events that will trigger the reactivation is the mayor's requisitioning of advances from the Federal Treasury. If that should occur, the borrowed funds will once again be deposited into an account controlled by the authority.

So I feel comfortable that sufficient safeguards are in place to protect the Federal taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good bill and deserves the support of this House.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST LEGISLATURE ACT OF 1995

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Representatives MAURICE HINCHEY, CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, PETER DEFazio, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, and myself are introducing legislation today, on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, which provides a giant step forward to rebuilding public confidence in the integrity of the U.S. Congress. Our bill helps make certain that all Members of Congress keep our focus on the public interest by requiring that Members of Congress put their stock portfolios and other financial assets in blind trusts or divest.

Did you know that numerous State and local governments require that public officeholders recuse themselves on voting matters in which they have financial interests at stake?

But not the U.S. Congress.

Did you know that Federal law since the Civil War bars a government official in the executive branch from participating in policy matters in which that official has a personal financial interest?

But not the U.S. Congress.

Currently, House Rule VIII requires that a Member of Congress not vote on matters of personal financial interest to that Member. But in truth, the scope of this rule has been dramatically narrowed over time to where it is now interpreted to mean that a Member of Congress should not vote when the matter is personal to him or her, but may vote on the

matter if the question affects a Member of Congress as one of a larger class, such as stockholders of a company or bondholders of a municipality or corporation.

Even at that, compliance with the provisions of House Rule VIII is now at the discretion of each Member of Congress and entirely voluntary. In practice, this has created a very lax environment in which potential and perceived financial conflicts of interest are common and often go undisclosed to voters and the general public. When questionable cases do come to light, they serve to heighten general public suspicion about the impact of special interest money and influence-peddling on congressional decision-making.

That is why we are introducing our new bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act—The Public Interest Legislature Act—to respond to growing public distrust arising from many Members of Congress routinely voting on bills in which they have financial interests. We believe it will go a long way toward rebuilding public confidence in the integrity of the U.S. Congress. Fundamentally it will reassure all Americans that their elected representatives in Congress are working full time on public business and not distracted or tempted to cash in on public service in any sense of those words.

Our bill has three main provisions:

First, to require that Members of Congress—subject to civil and criminal penalties for failure to do so—either put their stocks, bonds, and other financial assets—excluding their principal homes—in excess of \$1,000 into blind trusts; or, divest themselves of their stocks, bonds, and other financial assets in excess of \$1,000—excluding their principal homes.

Second, to strengthen the financial disclosure requirements of existing law to require more detailed, accurate, and timely reports on the financial assets of Members of Congress, their spouses, and their principal staff members involved with legislative activities of the Congress. At present, the disclosure requirements are of such wide ranges and so loose as to make the current disclosure requirements of marginal use in informing the public about potential financial conflicts of interest; and

Third, to prohibit Members of Congress from using official expenses to pay the costs associated with preparing financial disclosure reports.

This week the Congress is acting upon another part of the Contract With America—a proposed constitutional amendment to impose term limits on how long a person can serve as a Member of Congress which is referred to as the so-called Citizen Legislature Act.

Like so much of the Contract With America, the proposed Citizen Legislature Act is a bogus bill with a misleading title that does nothing about the real problem undermining the respect of the American people for their Congress—the funneling of enormous sums of special interest money into congressional campaigns and legislative lobbying.

The degree to which big money skews congressional policy making in favor of special interests over the public interest may be debatable. But there is absolutely no debate that many Americans now perceive that many Members of Congress run for office to enrich themselves indirectly, if not directly. Unless the Congress takes serious action to correct this perception, fewer and fewer Americans will hold on to the belief that the Congress is

capable of acting for the public interest of all Americans and not just privileged economic elites.

Our bill meets this threat to American democracy by insulating Members from allegations and suspicions of personal financial chicanery in the conduct of the people's business. As part of the 11-part Progressive Caucus Alternative to the Republican Contract With America—The Progressive Promise, this legislation represents real congressional ethics reform in contrast with self-serving gimmicks like term limits that will do nothing to reduce the corrosive influence of big money on congressional decision making.

TRIBUTE TO RUDOLPH T. GIVENS:
42 YEARS OF SERVICE TO MIAMI,
DADE COUNTY, AND THE WORLD

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, March 31, the people of Dade County will recognize the career and contributions of a truly remarkable man, Rudolph T. Givens. After 42 years on the job at the Port of Miami—the port's longest serving employee—Rudy Givens has retired.

Over his long tenure, Mr. Givens has truly seen it all and done it all. He started out in 1952 as a dock cleanup man at what was then the city of Miami commercial docks, a small operation in a quiet, small town.

He caps his career as Assistant to the Director of the Port of Miami, one of the busiest cruise and cargo ports in the world. What he did in the years in between is the stuff of legend at the Port of Miami.

Rudy Givens is much more than a dedicated and valuable employee. Never content merely to do a job, in every position he has ever held he has sought to provide good service—to make the port run as efficiently and effectively as humanly possible and to meet the many needs of the customers of the port, who hail from all over the world.

Rudy Givens' knowledge, judgment, and dedication cannot be replaced. But his reputation for excellence, the example he set for those for whom he worked and for those who worked for him, and his dedication to service will continue to positively influence the Port of Miami for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join with me and our Dade County community in wishing Rudy Givens and his wife, Edith, our thanks and best wishes for happiness and success in all their endeavors in the coming years.

TRIBUTE TO EMANUEL TAPP

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Emanuel Tapp of my Los Angeles staff. For nearly 8 years, Emanuel has rendered outstanding service as my secretary